REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,445,574 to Saw et al. (hereafter referred to as "Saw") in view of United States Patent Number 5,396,443 to Mese et al. (hereafter referred to as "Mese"). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-19 and 23-25 are not rendered obvious by Saw in view of Mese for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites an input detection system for an electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

> a first display component;
> a second display component disposed above said first display component;
> a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with a surface of said electronic device and wherein said sensor is operable to differentiate between a first height and a second height of said indication above said second display component; and
> a control circuit coupled to said sensor component and operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height, wherein an input at said first height corresponds to said first display component activated by said control

circuit, and wherein an input at said second height corresponds to said second display component activated by said control circuit.

Independent Claims 11 and 19 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 8-10 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 15-18 depend from independent Claim 11 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 23-25 depend from independent Claim 19 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a control circuit... operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height," "wherein an input at said first height corresponds to said first display component," and "wherein an input at said second height corresponds to said second display component" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited in the present application, an electronic device with two display components may receive inputs to a sensor at either a first height or a second height, where inputs at the first height correspond to a first display component and inputs at the second height correspond to a second display component.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Saw to teach a cellular phone without the ability to receive inputs to a sensor at a first and second height as claimed. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest a control circuit operable to register an indication as an input to the electronic device at either a first height corresponding to a first display component or second height corresponding to a second display component as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Saw, fails to cure the deficiencies of Saw discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Mese also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a control circuit... operable to register said indication as an input to said electronic device at one of said first height and said second height" and "wherein an input at said first height corresponds with said first display component and an input at said second height corresponds with said second display component" as recited in independent Claim 1.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Mese to teach an electronic device with a sensor capable of receiving a single input when a pen or finger is within a given distance (Abstract; Figure 2; col. 4, lines 41-55). Specifically, as a pen/finger begins at an infinite distance and moves toward the electronic device, the device is kept in a power saving state (no input) until the pen/finger moves with a given distance (e.g. "d") to the device and the device recognizes its presence and transitions to a non-power saving state. The device is unable to recognize the presence of a pen/finger outside a given distance from the device, thereby providing only a single input to the device when a pen/finger moves within a given distance from the device. Moreover, whereas the device and sensor of the present application is operable to receive two independent three-dimensional inputs (e.g., from gestures of a pen, finger, etc.) at either height, the device taught by Mese is limited to a single input regardless of the position of the pen/finger with regard to the electronic device. For example, even if the pen/finger is at two different heights within the given distance, the device taught by Mese will only register an "on" at both heights. As such, Mese teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that an electronic device

receives only a single input instead of two independent inputs corresponding to dual display components as claimed.

Regarding the limitations of Claims 3 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said sensor component is further operable to detect said electronic device being handled" and "said control system, responsive to said handling, for actuating said electronic device" as claimed. As described in the present application, the sensor component is operable to detect a user's handling of the electronic device. Further, the control system may then actuate the electronic device in response to this handling.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Saw to teach a device without a sensor for differentiating between a first and second height. Accordingly, Saw also fails to teach or suggest a sensor to detect a handling of the device as claimed. Since Saw fails to teach or suggest such a sensor, it follows that Saw also fails to teach or suggest a control system activating the device in Saw in response to such a detected handling as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Saw, fails to cure the deficiencies of Saw discussed above with respect to Claims 3 and 18. Specifically, Applicants understand Mese to teach an electronic device with a sensor capable of receiving a single input when a pen or finger is within a given distance. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that although the sensor of Mese may be able to detect a finger within a given distance from the electronic device, Mese fails to teach or suggest a sensor capable of detecting handling of the device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

submit that Mese also fails to teach or suggest a control system actuating the device in response to such handling.

Regarding the limitations of Claims 8, 15 and 23, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said control circuit is operable to... alter a detection threshold of said sensor component when said cover is in said open position" as claimed. As described in the present application, a control circuit is operable to alter a detection threshold of the sensor component when the cover is in an open position, where the detection threshold is a distance from a display component of the electronic device.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Saw to teach a device without a sensor for differentiating between a first and second height. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest altering a detection threshold of such a sensor as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Saw, fails to cure the deficiencies of Saw discussed above with respect to Claims 8, 15 and 23. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Mese also fails to teach or suggest altering a detection threshold of a sensor as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Mese teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that a detection threshold is not changed when additional layers are added or removed from between an approaching object and the sensor (Figures 6 and 7; col. 10, lines 3 to 65). Specifically, Mese teaches that a single detection threshold of 10mm is sufficient to accommodate LCD panel 603 and protecting glass 607, such that the system would work with

or without the additional layers. As such, assuming arguendo that the additional layers as taught by Mese are analogous to the cover as claimed, Mese teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching that a single threshold is used when the additional layers are removed instead of adjusting the threshold as claimed.

Regarding the limitations of Claims 9, 16 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said sensor component, responsive to said altered detection threshold, detects an indication above said second display component" as claimed. As described in the present application, a sensor is operable to detect an indication above a second display component in response to an altered detection threshold.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Saw to teach a device without a sensor for differentiating between a first and second height, and also not altering a detection threshold as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Saw fails to teach or suggest detecting an indication in response to altering a detection threshold of a sensor as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Mese, either alone or in combination with Saw, fails to cure the deficiencies of Saw discussed above with respect to Claims 9, 16 and 24. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Mese also fails to teach or suggest detecting an indication in response to altering a detection threshold of a sensor as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Saw in view of Mese, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since independent Claims 11 and 19 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11 and 19 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims and in light of the arguments presented for limitations of the dependent Claims, Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21 and 23-25 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Thus, Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-21 and 23-25 are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-21 and 23-25 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 6/23, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060